

(a) selecting source files having unread messages stored therein in the reverse order of which the unread messages were received;

(b) selecting source files having messages stored therein and having a predetermined priority level in the reverse order of which the most recently received messages stored therein were received; and

(c) selecting the remaining source files in the reverse order of which the most recently received messages stored within the remaining source files were received.

19/25. (Amended) The selective call receiver of Claim 24/18 wherein the predetermined priority level of each of said source files is user selectable.

REMARKS

Reexamination and reconsideration of this application as amended is requested. By this amendment, Claims 1, 3, 5 to 12, 15 and 22 to 25 have been amended and Claims 14 and 17 to 21 have been cancelled. Claims 1 to 13, 15, 16 and 22 to 25 remain in the application.

The Examiner, in the Official Action dated June 8, 1990, rejects Claims 1 to 12, 14, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Matai, et al. Applicant has cancelled Claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection has been traversed by the proposed amendments to Claims 1, 3, 5 to 12, 22 and 23 and the remarks below.

Matai, et al. discloses a method for handling individual messages transmitted for and received by a selective call receiver and common messages transmitted for several selective call receivers and received by the selective call receiver. The individual and common messages are distinguished by their addresses, i.e., individual messages received by the selective call receiver will have an address or addresses distinct from the address or addresses of the common messages received by the selective call receiver. A register MSTATUCS (FIG. 6d) in the RAM2 (FIG. 5) of the CPU show which memory areas of the RAM1

(FIG. 5) contain common messages (designated by a "1") or individual messages (designated by a "0"). According to the invention disclosed in Matai, it is possible to store individual messages and common messages in memory areas commensurate with the features of the messages (col. 11, lines 36 to 42), i.e., the individual messages are in an individual message memory, while the common messages are stored in a common paging memory.

The present invention has the advantage of allowing a selective call user to personalize a memory by providing for a greater number of messages from one originator, such as an employer, to be stored than from another originator, such as a wife or girlfriend. In this manner, the user who uses his selective call receiver primarily for business purposes would be able to store more business related messages without overwriting than personal messages. Furthermore, if the user's wife calls many times in one day with the same message "Call Home", the selective call receiver would not preempt memory for business-related messages by using memory to store each "Call Home" message. According to the present invention, a user can personalize the selective call receiver memory by specifying a plurality of message originators and allocating a number of message storage slots to each of the originators. The present invention has memory use advantages over the invention disclosed in Matai, et al. in that the user can define source files based on message originators and can allocate variable numbers of message storage slots to each source file. Matai, et al. is limited to differing between individual and common messages based upon the address of the message when storing the messages.

In accordance with the advantages of the present invention, Claim 1, as amended, calls for a method for saving a message transmitted to the communication receiver *individually*. The message includes a message source signal indicating the originator of the message. The method comprises receiving the message, decoding the message source signal and storing the message in one of a plurality of source files in response to the decoded message source signal.

Claim 1, as amended, is not rendered obvious by Matai, et al. because Matai, et al. does not contemplate categorizing

memory locations at any level below distinguishing common messages from individual messages. Claim 1 calls for storing individual messages (i.e., those transmitted to the communication receiver individually) in one of a plurality of source files.

Furthermore, Matai, et al. does not render obvious the step of Claim 1 of storing the message in one of the source files in response to the originator of the message, as identified by the message source signal.

Claims 2 to 10 depend from Claim 1. Claims 2 to 4 additionally call for storing the message in an unoccupied message storage slot in the source file (Claim 2) or in an occupied storage slot of the earliest received message, thereby overwriting the stored message (Claim 3) or in an earliest occupied unprotected storage slot (Claim 4). Claims 2 to 4 call for storing the message in a source file in response to the originator of the message, the message being an individual message received uniquely by the communication receiver, and thus Claims 2 to 4 are not rendered unpatentable by Matai, et al.

Claim 5, as amended, calls for additional steps prior to receiving the message of designating a source identification signal for each source file and allocating at least one message storage slot to each source file. Matai, et al. does not teach any forethought in regards to categorizing the memory. The sectors and files of Matai, et al. are assigned common or individual messages as the messages are received. Claim 5 claims an aspect of the primary advantage of the present invention which allows personalization of message memory prior to message reception. In this manner, the memory of the communication receiver could be categorized (i.e., allocated) based upon a past history of messages received. Thus, the categorization of Matai, et al. does not render Claim 5 unpatentable.

Claim 6, as amended, calls for storing the message in a source file as determined by a positive comparison of the designated source identification signal and the message source signal. Matai, et al. utilizes the received address to

determine whether the message is stored as a common or individual message. Yet the address indicates which destination (i.e., which receiver receives the message) whereas the message source signal as called for in the determination of Claim 6 indicates the message originator. Therefore, Claim 6 is not rendered obvious by Matai, et al.

Claims 7 to 9, as amended, additionally call for storing the message in an unoccupied message storage slot in the source file (Claim 7) or in an occupied storage slot of the earliest received message, thereby overwriting the stored message (Claim 8) or in an earliest occupied unprotected storage slot (Claim 9). Claims 7 to 9 call for storing the message in a source file in response to the originator of the message, the message being an individual message received uniquely by the communication receiver, and thus Claims 7 to 9 are not rendered unpatentable by Matai, et al.

Claim 10, as amended, claims the advantages of the present invention by calling for allocation of a user selectable number of message storage slots in each source file, allowing the user to personalize the memory of the communication receiver. The memory storage scheme of Matai, et al. does not allow for user input. In fact, Matai, et al. teaches away from user allocatable memory in that Matai, et al. discloses and automatic scheme for storing individual messages and common messages "in memory areas commensurate with their features in accordance with the information from a register and to efficiently utilize the memory areas" (col. 11, lines 36 to 42). The user allocation called for in Claim 10 may not be efficient utilization of the memory, but allows personalization of the memory usage by the user. Consequently, Claim 10 is not rendered unpatentable by Matai, et al.

Claim 11, as amended, calls for a memory means with a plurality of source files and a control means which stores information received in conjunction with a destination address in one of the source files in response to an originator signal within the information if the destination address addresses the apparatus. Claim 11 is not rendered obvious by Matai, et al. because the address is distinct from message originator signal

which determines the source file to store the message. Matai, et al. uses the address to determine which category (individual or common) of memory to store the message.

Claim 12 depends from Claim 11. Claim 12, as amended, combines original Claim 14 and calls for each of the source files of Claim 11 comprising a user selectable number of message storage slots. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claim 12, as amended, is not rendered obvious by Matai, et al. for the reasons stated above in regards to Claim 11 and because the user can select the number of message storage slots within the source files. While it is true that the memory means of Matai, et al. can be chosen to have greater or smaller capacity as dependent upon the user's needs, as the Examiner states in the Official Action dated June 8, 1990, the size of the memory devoted to common or individual messages is chosen automatically as the messages are received to efficiently use the memory. Matai, et al. therefore teaches away from the user choosing the number of message storage slots within each source file as called for in Claim 12. Thus, Claim 12 is not rendered unpatentable by Matai, et al.

Claim 22, as amended, calls for a selective call receiver which receives messages having selective call addresses and message source signals. An address correlation means of the control means of the selective call receiver correlates the selective call address with one predetermined selective call address stored in a storage means. If the selective call address is substantially equivalent to the predetermined selective call address, a storage control means of the control means stores the message in a message storage slot of one of a plurality of source files in response to the message source signal. A source file selection means selects a message from a message storage slot for display on a display means. Matai, et al. does not render Claim 22 unpatentable because Matai, et al. discloses categorization of messages based upon addresses, teaching away from utilization of a message source signal as called for in Claim 22.

Claim 23 depends from Claim 22. Claim 23 additionally calls for a user selectable number of message storage slots in

each source file. Matai, et al. teaches away from user selectability in that the invention of Matai, et al. efficiently uses memory by automatically storing information based upon its categorization. Thus, Claim 23 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Matai, et al.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claims 1 to 12, 14, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is traversed by the cancellation of Claim 14 and the amendment and remarks and that Claims 1 to 12, 22 and 23 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13, 15 to 21, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Matai, et al. as applied to Claims 1 to 12 and further in view of Smoot, et al. Applicant has cancelled Claims 17 to 21. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection has been traversed by the proposed amendments to Claims 11, 12, 15, 24 and 25 and the remarks herein.

Smoot, et al. discloses a pager which can receive emergency calls and nonemergency calls. The emergency calls which must be answered immediately are alerted and immediately presented to the user. The nonemergency calls are alerted and stored in a memory for later perusal by the user.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 11 and, therefore, Applicant incorporates the remarks above in regards to Claim 11. The unique limitations of Claim 11 over the disclosure of Matai, et al. are equally applicable to Smoot, et al. Claim 11, and therefore Claim 13 depending from Claim 11, calls for a message originator signal distinct from the address which determines which source file to store the message. Smoot, et al. and Matai, et al. teach utilization of the address to determine how to handle the message. Smoot, et al. further discloses handling of emergency messages different from nonemergency messages. For the reasons stated above, Claim 13 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Matai, et al. in view of Smoot, et al.

Claim 15, as amended, depends from Claim 13 and calls for a particular priority of selection to be performed by the source file select means when selecting one of the source files for display. While the primary purpose of the present invention is

to allow personalization of memory allocation, a necessary requirement of memory allocation is an effective retrieval system for retrieving the messages from the allocated memory. In furtherance thereof, Claim 15, as amended, sets a priority scheme for displaying source file indicators (as shown in FIGs. 4A, 4C and 4D) and messages contained within the source files in the order of (a) source files with unread messages therein, later received/earlier displayed, (b) source files with a predetermined priority, later received messages stored therein/earlier displayed, and (c) remaining source files, later received messages stored therein/earlier displayed. The order of selection is a further limitation on Claim 13 and therefore is not rendered obvious by the combination of Matai, et al. in view of Smoot, et al. for the reasons stated above and the further limitations therein.

Claim 16 depending from Claim 15 calls for the priority level of each of the source files to be user selectable. Smoot, et al., when addressing priority, merely distinguishes between two categories: emergency and nonemergency. User selectability of priority of messages having a specific origin is not contemplated by Smoot, et al. nor addressed by Matai, et al. Thus, Claim 16 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Matai, et al. and Smoot, et al.

Claims 17 to 21 have been cancelled.

Claim 24 depends from Claim 22 calling for the source file selection means sequentially selecting source files for display in the order: (a) source files with unread messages, later received/earlier displayed, (b) source files with a predetermined priority, later received messages stored therein/earlier displayed, and (c) remaining source files, later received messages stored therein/earlier displayed. For the reasons stated above in regards to Claims 15 and 22, Applicant submits that Claim 24 is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Matai, et al. and Smoot, et al.

Claim 25 depends from Claim 24 and, for the reasons stated above in regards to Claims 22 and Claim 16, Applicant submits that Claim 25 is not rendered obvious by Matai, et al. and Smoot, et al.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 13, 15 to 21, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome by the cancellation of Claims 17 to 21 and by the amendment and remarks and that Claims 13 and 16 and amended Claims 15, 24 and 25 are now in condition for allowance.

The additional reference cited by the Examiner has been reviewed and is not believed to affect the patentability of the claims as amended.

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action mailed June 8, 1990, and it is submitted that Claims 1 to 13, 15, 16 and 22 to 25 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of Claims 2, 4, 13 and 16, and amended Claims 1, 3, 5 to 12, 15, and 22 to 25 is earnestly solicited. Applicant submits that no fee is presently due. If it is found that a fee is due and owing or an overpayment has been received, please charge the fee or deposit the overpayment to deposit account #13-4778.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (407) 364-2860 is respectfully solicited. As the "364" exchange assigned to the undersigned is a relatively new exchange and as there are reported difficulties with the long distance carrier handling calls from the Patent Office to the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to report any difficulties reaching the undersigned (such as a recorded message stating that the Examiner has misdialled the number) to the long distance service handling the call or, in the alternative, to try to reach the undersigned at (407) 738-2860 (the prior telephone number assigned to the undersigned).

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL J. DELUCA

Daniel R. Collopy

Daniel R. Collopy
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,667
Tel. (407) 364-2860
FAX (407) 364-2825

MOTOROLA, INC.
Patent Department
1500 N. W. 22 Avenue
Boynton Beach, Florida 33426